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Today’s briefing

- Alice Washington, California Institute for Behavioral Health Solutions
- Allison Hamblin, Center for Health Care Strategies
- Panel:
  - Andrew Gruchy, San Bernardino County Department of Behavioral Health
  - Takashi Wada, Inland Empire Health Plan
  - Margaret Kisliuk, Partnership HealthPlan of California
  - Louise Rogers, San Mateo County Health
  - Scott Gilman, San Mateo County Health
- Q&A
Medi-Cal has a divided behavioral health care system

**Behavioral Health System for Medi-Cal Patients**

- **Medi-Cal Managed Care Plans**
  Physical health services and mild-to-moderate mental health services

- **County Mental Health Plans**
  Specialty mental health services for serious mental illness

- **County Substance Use Disorder Services**
  Services to treat substance use and addiction
Lack of integration affects access, quality, and consumer experience

People with serious mental illness are more than twice as likely to have a severe or chronic physical health condition...

...many of which are preventable.
Medi-Cal Healthier California for All proposes significant changes to the behavioral health delivery system

• Behavioral health proposals
  • Behavioral health payment reform
  • Revisions to behavioral health medical necessity
  • Administrative behavioral health (mental health and substance use disorder) integration statewide
  • Behavioral health regional contracting
  • Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System (DMC-ODS) renewal and improvements
  • Institutions for Mental Disease (IMD) expenditure waiver

• Full integration plans
Integration must take place at multiple levels

**Single point of accountability**

**Operational integration**
- Data functions: collection, reporting, analytics
- Managed care functions: credentialing, claims, call centers
- Network management

**Financial integration**
- Aligned incentives for total cost of care
- Payment structures that support value-based payment

**Clinical integration**
- Variety of models: colocation, team-based care, shared EHRs
- Care coordination
Briefing: Behavioral Health Integration in Medi-Cal

February 18, 2020
Behavioral Health Integration: National Landscape Overview
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About the Center for Health Care Strategies

A nonprofit policy center dedicated to improving the health of low-income Americans
Delivery System Levers to Advance Financial Integration

27 states include specialty behavioral health in health plan contracts

13 states have Medicaid ACOs; subset focuses on physical-behavioral health integration

Specialty Behavioral Health Financing Models by State

*Primary Model of Specialty Behavioral Health Financing* (2019)

Key

- Integrated financing in managed care organizations
- Behavioral health benefits carved out to behavioral health organizations or to fee-for-service (FFS)
- Physical and behavioral health benefits financed in FFS
- Specialty integrated plans for individuals with serious behavioral health needs

Outcomes Associated with Integrated Financing

**Arizona:** Adults with severe mental illness (SMI) enrolled in specialty integrated plans showed improvements in all measures related to patient experience, ambulatory care, preventive care, and chronic disease management

» Mixed outcomes with hospital-related utilization measures

**Washington State:** Enrollees in early-adopter region of fully integrated managed care showed improvements

» Most significant improvement in access to treatment measures, including for those with SMI or SUD

» Modest improvements in quality, coordination of care, and utilization

» Notable improvements in social measures such as homelessness and criminal justice interactions

# Levers to Advance Clinical Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>States</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data-Sharing and Quality Measures</strong></th>
<th><strong>Payment and Business Practices</strong></th>
<th><strong>Clinical Practice and Service Design</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Invest in statewide data-sharing infrastructure  
▪ Develop comprehensive quality measures | ▪ Eliminate financing silos  
▪ Develop financial incentives  
▪ Require plans to implement value-based payment  
▪ Support provider readiness | ▪ Provide guidance and comprehensive monitoring  
▪ Assess the need for regulatory reforms | |
| **Plans** | **Share enrollment and encounter data with providers**  
▪ Support providers in using newly available data | ▪ Partner with providers to develop value-based payment arrangements inclusive of physical and behavioral health services | ▪ Develop provider networks that incorporate the full array of needed services |
| **Providers** | ▪ Use integrated data to identify gaps in care  
▪ Coordinate treatment plans  
▪ Assess the impact of services on outcomes | ▪ Pursue partnerships that increase scope of services and advance integrated practices | ▪ Redesign services and staffing to enable integrated team-based and patient-centered care |

Key Considerations in Designing an Integrated System

- Selecting the platform for integration
- Phasing of populations and/or regions
- Allowing delegation
- Managing non-Medicaid services/populations
- Integrating Medicare services for dually eligible individuals
Key Ingredients for Successful Implementation

- Engage stakeholders early and often
- Employ joint-ownership models
- Marry expertise of physical and behavioral health partners
- Ensure stable system transitions
- Allow adequate time for planning and implementation
Visit CHCS.org to . . .

- **Download** practical resources to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of Medicaid services

- **Learn** about cutting-edge efforts to improve care for Medicaid’s highest-need, highest-cost beneficiaries

- **Subscribe** to CHCS email, blog, and social media updates to learn about new programs and resources

- **Follow** us on Twitter @CHCShealth
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Physical and Behavioral Health Integration Pilot

A Joint Pilot with the Inland Empire Health Plan and San Bernardino County Department of Behavioral Health
Why Integrate?

- Current system can lead to poor outcomes for some patients, with many dying decades early often due to treatable physical health conditions.
- Patients must navigate multiple complex systems; siloed systems of financing hinder treating all of a patient’s health issues.
- Limited ability for providers to share patient information and to manage and track referrals, resulting in poor coordination.
- Inland Empire Health Plan (IEHP) members who also have an SMI or SUD diagnosis use *twice* as many emergency room and inpatient services compared to other IEHP members.
Currently, health services are funded through different sources and offered by different providers, resulting in a complicated system that challenges patient navigation and care coordination, and complicates whole-person care efforts.

**CURRENT DELIVERY SYSTEM OF CARE**

Currently, health services are funded through different sources and offered by different providers, resulting in a complicated system that challenges patient navigation and care coordination, and complicates whole-person care efforts.

**Results:**
- Fragmented Member Experience
- Inconsistent Care Coordination
- Higher Cost/Poor Outcomes
Why Now?

- Integration of physical and behavioral health have long been goals for both IEHP and the San Bernardino County Department of Behavioral Health (SB DBH)
- DHCS’s Medi-Cal Healthier California for All initiatives envision an integrated future
- The pilot has the potential to improve outcomes and the patient experience now
Origins of the Integration Pilot

- Leadership from IEHP and SB DBH convened in April 2019 and agreed to proceed with planning a comprehensive integration pilot
  - Goal: to fully integrate physical and behavioral health (SMI and SUD)
  - A financial arrangement, with shared risk/savings/integration beyond current system seen as practical
  - An evaluation component to share lessons learned
- Workgroups from IEHP and SB DBH organized around care delivery, financing, and communications
  - Teams meet separately in each organization, and jointly, to develop strategy and to proceed with implementation
The Integration Model: Care Delivery

- Integrated pilot clinics will offer all mental health and substance use disorder outpatient services (including case management)
- On-site primary care providers will be an integral part of the care team and will closely manage patient care in partnership with behavioral health providers and medical specialists
- A standardized referral process will be created for access to specialty physical health services
- Care management / care coordination teams at each clinic will serve those with SMI, chronic physical health conditions, and high utilization of emergency rooms (ERs)/hospitals
Key Integration Issues

- Addressing different organizational cultures, stakeholders, and leadership

- **Developing clinical integration model** by assessing approaches:
  - (1) DBH hires primary care provider, (2) FQHC contract, (3) medical group contract
  - Care management model approach and implementation

- **Sharing data** to model utilization and project costs

- Estimating costs (given substantial uncertainty)
  - Primary care costs for SMI population, care coordination costs, potential hospitalization and ER use savings

- **Financing model**
  - How will funding flow? What resources can each organization contribute to the pilot population (e.g., Mental Health Services Act funds, enhanced capitation rate for primary care for SMI population)? How can funds be blended/braided?
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Mild-to-moderate mental health services
• 8%–9% penetration rate in all 14 counties

PCPs and others providing MAT
• Over 100 “X-waivered” providers serving over 5,000 members

Substance use services
• 8-county Regional Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System (DMC-ODS); alignment with other counties
PHC Regional DMC-ODS: Financial Model

Overall goal: Maximize state and federal reimbursement, and leverage current PHC services

1. PHC charges each county a “per utilizer per month” rate based on expected costs and utilization.

2. County will bill share of costs to state and federal governments, and PHC will pay county for services rendered.

3. After a year of experience, a reconciliation will ensure that structure was fair and did not over- or undercharge.
Members
Qualifications
• Medi-Cal coverage
• Meet American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) medical necessity criteria
How members receive services
• Designated agencies (e.g., criminal justice, child welfare)
• Self-referral; no prior approval needed for most services
• Provider referral

Providers
Two types
• Substance use specific: certified as Drug Medi-Cal qualified by the state
• Current PHC network (e.g., clinics providing medication)

Service Locations
• Goal of serving clients in their communities as much as possible
• Residential, methadone, and some other services out of county
Partnering with Health Plan of San Mateo for more than 30 years to help low-income San Mateo County (SMC) residents live longer and better lives.

What opportunities are we looking for in our next phase of partnership and through the next Medi-Cal waiver?

Louise Rogers, Chief of Health
Scott Gilman, Director, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services
February 18, 2020
Who we are

• 765,000 San Mateo County residents
• SMC Health serves 100,000 county residents; delivery system includes public hospital and clinics, behavioral health and recovery services, correctional health, family health, aging and adult, public health; both directly operated and contracted
• Health Plan of San Mateo, a publicly accountable County Organized Health System (COHS), has 130,000 publicly insured members (Medi-Cal, Medicare) plus 21,000 insured on behalf of county
• Easier to try new things in SMC, e.g., first county pilot for specialty carve out for mental health; reimbursement through a case rate model
Where we’ve been as a partnership

SMC Health behavioral health: experience as managed care plan for all publicly insured

- SMC Health Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS) specialty mental health carve out and Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System for substance use disorders
- SMC Health BHRS delegated behavioral health plan for other lines of business for Health Plan of San Mateo (HPSM) including mild-to-moderate benefits

SMC Health: experience providing care coordination for high-needs beneficiaries of HPSM

- SMC Health Family Health / HPSM partnership for Whole Child Model (formerly California Children’s Services)
- SMC Health Aging and Adult / HPSM partnership for certain high-needs adults, Partners for Independence
- SMC Health BHRS, Public Health, and other divisions all delivering Whole Person Care

Behavioral health / primary care coordination and integration models within the delivery system, with “back end” coordination
Where we want to go with our partnership

• Continue working together on delivery system reforms, including partnerships that meet the needs of highest-risk clients (e.g., Whole Person Care)

• Look again at the challenge of meeting increasing back-end requirements that drive the fragmented front-end delivery system experience of our patients — and their results

• Ask whether the managed care functions we are both doing add value to our patients’ experience

• Ask where each partner’s core competencies are strongest; leverage strengths
Where we want to go with our partnership

• Improve beneficiary experience by reducing complexity and the need to navigate multiple systems

• Improve provider experience by reducing complexity and the need to navigate multiple systems

• Align funding, data reporting, quality, and infrastructure to mobilize and incentivize toward common goals across physical, mental, and substance use care

• Maintain accountability for results

• Maximize benefit to low-income residents